

To: CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Cc: CN=Melissa Scianni/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
From: CN=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Fri 6/18/2010 1:21:43 AM
Subject: Re: Quick thoughts about BDCP alternatives presentation

Yes - hopefully they will be ready to unveil and discuss at next BECT.
Is there something specific for us to advise before then to better address 404 criteria?

Allegedly, FWS and NOAA support this range.
Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

From: Erin Foresman
Sent: 06/16/2010 09:21 AM PDT
To: Karen Schwinn
Cc: Melissa Scianni; Tom Hagler
Subject: Quick thoughts about BDCP alternatives presentation

I read through the powerpoints that Karen sent. Have a few thoughts I wanted to share.

The BECT meeting power point illustrates that the applicants are not preparing the NEPA document to cover CWA requirements. The screening criteria include NEPA and CEQA purpose and alternatives considerations, not CWA. CWA is not mentioned in the presentation.
The alternatives should be driven by recovery of the species, not solely around conveyance. A point we and hopefully FWS & NMFS can make at a future date.
Slide 9 in the Steering Committee presentation is interesting. The "most likely" scenario contains the greatest exports of water out of hte Delta approaching 7M ac/ft.

Erin Foresman
US EPA Region 9
1325 J Street, 14th floor
C/O Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento, CA 95814-2922
Phone: (916) 557 5253
Fax: (916) 557 6877

-----Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US wrote: -----

Hi Karen and Erin,

The BDCP BECT meeting was very short (~45 min) so I'm glad I didn't go all the way to Sac. The attached range of alternatives ppt was presented. They essentially just stepped through the screening criteria. Here are some summary points:

The screening criteria will be included as an appendix in the EIR/EIS.

If the range of alternatives identified through the screening process do not meet all of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act (slide #11) and the Agency scoping comments (slide #12), then additional alternatives will need to be added back in.

It was pointed out (not sure by whom, sorry) that even though the project contains multiple components, the alternatives are driven exclusively around conveyance. The document needs to fully address all components of the project, not just conveyance.

The document will not consider alternatives that have technical issues or need more studies (e.g. ammonia). The document will also not consider alternatives to the HCP.

The lead agencies have applied the screening criteria and are refining the range of alternatives to be included in the EIR/EIS. Once the lead agencies have the complete list, they will present it to the group.

Melissa Scianni
Wetlands Office (WTR-8)
EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne St
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 972-3821

. (See attached file: June 2010 Sizing Charts v4.pptx) (See attached file: REVISED DRAFT Presentation for Range of Alternatives for June 15 2010 BECT v4.pptx)

[attachment "June 2010 Sizing Charts v4.pptx" deleted by Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US] [attachment "REVISED DRAFT Presentation for Range of Alternatives for June 15 2010 BECT v4.pptx" deleted by Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US]